

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached nine (9) Replacement Drawing sheets for FIGS. 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 4A-4B are submitted herewith to replace the original eight (8) drawing sheets for FIGS. 1, 2A-2C, 3A-3B, 4A-4B. No new matter has been added through the drawing amendments.

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated November 8, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendment to the drawings, the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Following the present amendment, claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-26 are currently pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 13, 17, and 18 are independent. In particular, Applicants amended claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-18; cancelled claims 4 and 12 without disclaimer or prejudice, and added new claims 19-26. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment adds no new subject matter to the present application and serves only to place the present application in better condition for examination. Therefore, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Figures

Applicants herein include Figures 1-4b (9 sheets) which should be sufficient to place the present application in compliance with U.S. Patent Practice.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, First and Second Paragraphs

Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for because the recited "patent practice" of claim 13 was not disclosed in the specification. This language represents a stylistic error, and Applicants apologize for any confusion from the error. Claim 13 has been amended to remove this language.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly failing to distinctly and clearly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action noted that the phrase “said user” lacked antecedent basis. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully urge that these grounds for rejection be are moot in view of the present amendments and request that these rejections be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims 9 and 13-16 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(e)/103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by PCT Published Patent Application No. WO 2002/098062 (Saunders). However, as described in greater detail below, Saunders fails to disclose each and every limitation of these claims as required for a proper rejection under 35 USC §102(e). Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-3 and 5-11 depend recites an apparatus that includes an access controller connected to an access network and a domain, wherein the access network is configured to attach to user equipment. This access controller is configured to control resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within this domain or accessible via this domain, and server addresses that are not within this domain or accessible via this domain. Also, this access controller is configured to receive

from this user equipment a query identifying a domain name; and in response to a determination that this user equipment is authorized and there is specified for this domain name a server address within this domain or accessible via this domain, resolve domain name information for this domain name within this domain. In response to a determination that the user equipment is not authorized and/or that there is no specified server address for this domain name within this domain or accessible via this domain resolve the domain name information for this domain name outside this domain.

Independent claim 13, from which claims 14-16 depend relates to a system that includes user equipment and an access network to which this user equipment is configured to attach. The system also includes an access controller configured to connect to this access network, and a domain to which this access controller is connected. In particular, the access controller is configured to control resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within this domain or accessible via this domain, and server addresses that are not within this domain or accessible via this domain. Also, this access controller is configured to receive from this user equipment a query identifying a domain name. In response to a determination that this user equipment is authorized and there is specified for this domain name a server address within this domain or accessible via this domain, this access controller resolves domain name information for this domain name within this domain. Similarly, in response to a determination that this user equipment is not authorized and/or that there is no specified server address for this domain name within this domain or accessible via this domain, this

access controller resolves the domain name information for this domain name outside this domain.

Independent claim 17, from which claims 19-26 depend, relates to a method, that includes receiving, at an access controller connected to a domain and an access network from user equipment attached to this access network, a query identifying a domain name. In response to a determination that this user equipment is authorized and there is specified for this domain name a server address within this domain or accessible via this domain, domain name information is resolved for this domain name within this domain. Similarly, in response to a determination that this user equipment is not authorized and/or that there is no specified server address for this domain name within this domain or accessible via this domain, the domain name information is resolved for this domain name outside this domain.

Independent claim 18 relates to an apparatus that includes a receiving means for receiving at an access controller connected to an access network and a domain from user equipment attached to this access network a query identifying a domain name. The apparatus further includes a controlling means for, in response to a determination that this user equipment is authorized and there is specified for this domain name a server address within this domain or accessible via this domain, resolving domain name information for this domain name within this domain. The controlling means further, in response to a determination that this user equipment is not authorized and/or that there is no specified

server address for this domain name within this domain or accessible via this domain, is for resolving domain name information for this domain name outside this domain.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Saunders and respectfully submit that each of the above-noted independent claims recites subject matter that is not taught or disclosed by Saunders.

Saunders generally relates to providing secure access to applications, such as intranet access and corporate e-mail systems from mobile terminals, such as cellular telephones and Personal Digital Assistants (PDA) using Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) by using an identifier that is unique to the mobile terminal (either the handset itself or the Subscriber Information Module (SIM) card that is used in the handset). This identifier is passed to the authentication systems used by the service provider after the conventional verification of username and password details. If the identifier matches the record held in the authentication database then the service provider returns a number of user-specific service options corresponding to the WAP identifier.

Referring to claim 1, Applicants respectfully urge that Saunders does not disclose the access controller provided in embodiments of the present application. As described below, Saunders does not control resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within a network or accessible via said network and also server addresses that are not within a network or accessible via a network, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and to better define the recited embodiments Applicants herein have amended claim 1 to recite that the access controller

is configured to, in response to a determination that this user equipment is authorized and there is specified for this domain name a server address within this domain or accessible via this domain, resolve domain name information for this domain name within this domain. Conversely, in response to a determination that the user equipment is not authorized and/or that there is no specified server address for this domain name within this domain or accessible via this domain, the access controller is configured to resolve the domain name information for this domain name outside this domain.

For example, as disclosed in the present application, the access controller 16 described at paragraphs [0032] to [0047] is configured to resolve domain name, whether or not the user equipment is authorized, and consequently, whether the specified server address for this domain name within this domain or, and also on the written information provided. See also, the access controller AC (16) in FIGS. 2b, 3a and 4a and the associated text.

In contrast, the Office Action identifies that the proxy server 70 of Figures 2 and 3 of Saunders corresponds to the recited access controller of claim 1. Saunders, for example at page 7, lines 1 to 3, discloses that the proxy server 70 is provided between the WAP gateway 20 and network 40 to control access to parts of network 40. However, Saunders contains no disclosure of the proxy server 70 of Figures 2 and 3 of WO-02/098062 as being configured to either (a) control resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within said network 40 or accessible via said network 40 and also server addresses that are not within said network 40 or accessible via

said network 40. Furthermore, Saunders does not disclose or suggest that the proxy server 70 is configured to make a determination as to whether there is specified for a domain name identified in a query from terminal 10 a server address within network 40 or accessible via said network 40, and in response to a determination that there is such a server address specified to resolve domain name information for said domain name within network 40, and in response to a determination that there is no such server address specified to resolve domain name information for said domain name outside of network 40, as presently recited in claim 1.

For these and other reasons, Saunders does not disclose each and every of claim 1. Hence, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is legally improper, and claim 1 is consequently allowable over Saunders. Claims 3, 5, 11 are similarly allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable claim 1. Also, independent claims 13, 17, and 18, although separately rejected and different in scope, contain similar recitation related to an access controller that is configured to resolve domain names whether or not the user device is authorized are, thus, similarly allowable of Saunders. Claim 14 is likewise allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable claim 13. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 14, 17, and 18 are thus respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 8-10, 12, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable in view of the combination of Saunders, further in view of PCT Published Patent Application No. WO 2002/47415 (Westman). According to the Office

Action, Saunders discloses all elements of the base independent claims, and Westman discloses the limitations of the dependent claims. However, as described in greater detail below, the combination of Saunders and Westman fails to disclose each and every limitation of these claims as required for a proper rejection under 35 USC §103(a). Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants are quite familiar with Westman, since it is co-assigned to the same assignee of the present application. Applicants have carefully reviewed Westman and respectfully submit that each of Westman does not cure the above described deficiencies in Saunders.

Referring to claim 1, Westman does not disclose or suggest an access controller provided in embodiments of the present application. As described below, Westman does not disclose controlling the resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within a network or accessible via said network and also server addresses that are not within a network or accessible via a network, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Westman relates to a communications in which a user equipment contains, or is provided with, a list of items of service-related information. The list of service-related information represents a list of service provider names, services and/or service types. When intending to establish or modify a session or connection or use a service, the user equipment selects, in one of the embodiments, an item from the list and performs a DNS query to resolve the name of the selected item to an IP address which

then is used for set-up. The list may be provided by an DHCP server or in a PDP context message. The list may include one or more service provider default names, in particular for visited and home networks. Nevertheless, in no way does Westman disclose controlling a resolution of domain name information for both server addresses within a network or accessible via said network and also server addresses that are not within a network or accessible via a network, as recited in claim 1.

For these and other reasons, the combination of Saunders and Westman does not disclose each and every of claim 1. Claims 8-10 are allowable over Saunders and Westman for at least the reason of depending from allowable claim 1, and this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is legally improper. Also, independent claim 13, although separately rejected and different in scope, contain similar recitation related to an access controller that is configured to resolve domain names whether or not the user device is authorized are, thus, similarly allowable of Saunders. Thus, claims 15 and 16 rejected in view of the combination of Saunders and Westman is likewise allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable claim 13. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 8-10, 15, and 16 are thus respectfully requested. The rejection of claim 4 and 12 is now moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable in view of the combination of Saunders, further in view of PCT Published Patent Application No. WO 2000/64104 (Roos). According to the Office Action, Saunders discloses all elements of the claims except for an authorizing server function.

To address this deficiency in Saunders, the Office Action cites to Roos. However, as described in greater detail below, the combination of Saunders and Roos fails to disclose each and every limitation of these claims as required for a proper rejection under 35 USC §103(a). Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Roos and respectfully submit that Roos does not cure the above described deficiencies in Saunders.

Referring to claim 1, Roos does not disclose or suggest an access controller provided in embodiments of the present application. For example, as described below, Roos does not disclose controlling the resolving of domain name information for both server addresses within a network or accessible via said network and also server addresses that are not within a network or accessible via a network, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Roos relates to establishing a data connection with a mobile terminal in a digital mobile network, at which the mobile network is in connection with data processing resources in a local network. The establishing of the data connection includes allocation of a local network address to the mobile terminal, allocation of a unique network address to the mobile terminal, determination of a relation between the local network address and the unique network address, reception of a request for a data connection to the unique network address, establishing of a data connection to the unique network address, at which the set up is made depending on the relation between the local and the unique network address. Nevertheless, Roos, in no way, discloses the controlling

of a resolution of domain name information for both server addresses within a network or accessible via said network and also server addresses that are not within a network or accessible via a network, as recited in claim 1.


For these and other reasons, the combination of Saunders and Roos also does not disclose each and every of claim 1. Thus, claims 6-7 are allowable over Saunders and Roos for at least the reason of depending from allowable claim 1, and this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is legally improper. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-7 are thus respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-26, including independent claims 1, 13, 17 and 18, recites features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that each of these claims be allowed, and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David D. Nelson
Registration No. 47,818

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800; Fax: 703-720-7802

DDN/jkm:cqc

Enclosures: Substitute Drawings for Figures 1-4b (Nine (9) Sheets)
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal
Check No. 018062